

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed August 11, 2003. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration of the Application. Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 33 have been amended to clarify, more particularly point out, and more distinctly claim inventive concepts previously present in these claims. These amendments are not considered necessary for patentability. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added by the amendments to the claims. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Applicants have responded to each notation by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 102 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11-14, 17, 19-22, 25, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Developing a WFT Workflow System* ("*WFT*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that *WFT* fails to disclose all the elements specifically recited in Applicants' claims. For example, *WFT* fails to disclose a "contract specifying an interaction between a workflow step and a programming entity, the interaction comprising a service that the programming entity provides for the workflow step when the workflow step is executed, the workflow step and the contract operable to be used for a next workflow" (recited in Applicants' independent Claim 1, as amended).

The Examiner relies on *WFT* at page 5-9 to disclose a contract. (Office Action, page 3.) *WFT* at page 5-9 discloses a task editor for creating a task. According to *WFT*, "You customize tasks by editing them using the SNAP Development Environment, which you access from the Task Editor." (*WFT*, page 5-9.) *WFT*, however, fails to disclose a "contract specifying an interaction between a workflow step and a programming entity, the interaction comprising a service that the programming entity provides for the workflow step when the workflow step is executed," as recited by amended Claim 1.

The Examiner also relies on a server and nodes of *WFT* to disclose a contract. (Office Action, page 3.) *WFT* discloses Figure 2-2 of the conceptual architecture of a WFT workflow system that includes a server and nodes. (*WFT*, page 2-6.) however, fails to disclose a "contract specifying an interaction between a workflow step and a programming

entity, the interaction comprising a service that the programming entity provides for the workflow step when the workflow step is executed," as recited by amended Claims 1.

Consequently, at a minimum, *WFT* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the contract of Applicants' amended claim. For at least these reasons, *WFT* fails to disclose the elements specifically recited in Applicants' independent Claim 1. For similar reasons, *WFT* fails to disclose the elements specifically recited in Applicants' independent Claims 9, 17, 25, and 33.

Applicants' dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claims and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the prior art. Because Applicants believe they have amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claims over the prior art, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicants have not provided detailed remarks concerning these dependent claims. Applicants, however, remain ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 33 and all claims that depend on these claims.

Section 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 2, 7, 8, 10, 15, 16, 18, 23, 24, 26, and 31-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *WFT* in light of U.S. Patent No. 5,455,903 to Jolissaint et al. ("*Jolissaint*"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

For at least the reasons provided above, *WFT* does not disclose, teach, or suggest the elements specifically recited in Applicants' independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 33, whether *WFT* is considered alone or in combination with *Jolissaint* or any other prior art of record or with knowledge of one skilled in the art at the time of the invention. Applicants' dependent claims are allowable based on their dependence on the independent claims and further because they recite numerous additional patentable distinctions over the prior art. Because Applicants believe they have amply demonstrated the allowability of the independent claims over the prior art, and to avoid burdening the record, Applicants have not provided detailed remarks concerning the dependent claims. Applicants, however, remain ready to provide such remarks if it becomes appropriate to do so.

ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.
062891.0446

PATENT APPLICATION
09/715,978

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, and 33 and all claims that depend on these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Keiko Ichiye, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6494.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Keiko Ichiye
Reg. No. 45,460

KI/lis

Correspondence Address:

Baker Botts L.L.P.
2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600
Dallas, Texas 75201-2980
(214) 953-6494
Date: November 10, 2003